

From: Pretoria

GH 704

ZA 171

Osborn to Havelock 30/4/87 Eshowe /Acks Hav's of 25/4 No88/ enclsing copy of a letter from Mr Lucas Meyer dated 16th April and directing me to report the steps that should be taken to ^{enable} ~~make~~ the Zulus to give to Mr Meyer an expression of their desire to be relieved of the Protection of the Burghers of the New Republic.

The readiest manner for the Zulus to do this would be by their sending to Mr Meyer at Vryheid a notification of their desire by a duly authorised deputation. This course will however, I think, ~~be~~ ^{be} found impracticable as the Zulus will be afraid, or pretend to be afraid, that personal violence would be done by the Boers to the members of the deputation for venturing to come to Vryheid on such an errand the object of which is to sever political connection between the Zulus and the Boers. / / It is also probable that the chiefs will aver that there is no necessity for them to make such a notification to Mr Meyer as they repudiate the allegation that Zulus placed themselves under the protection of the Boers of the New Republic. They would be likely to argue that making such an expression of their desire to be relieved from the Boer protection would be by them that they had accepted and were under the Boer protection. / I mention these objections which I expect will be raised by Umyanana and the other chiefs. At the same time, as it certainly appears to be important that they should signify to Mr Meyer their desire to be relieved from the protection of the New Republic, I think it would be advisable to afford them full facility to do so. With that object, I would suggest that a meeting be held at Knight's camp attended by the chiefs and a Boer deputation /

/It should be explained to the chiefs that although they deny ~~signing the~~
~~piece~~ placing themselves under the Boer's protection there is the Proclamation
dated 14/8/84* signed by Cinuluzlu and Grant which the N R holds as still
binding but which they are now willing to relinquish. / "It could be further
explained to them that, unless they availed themselves of the present ~~x~~
opportunity to get relieved from the protection of the Burghers of the New
Republic, it would be not impossible that the Boers would assert the right
and assume the position accorded them as set forth in the Proclamation referred
to, including the authority as well as the responsibility attaching thereto.

I think that, if these things are pointed out to the chiefs, any
objections they may otherwise be inclined to bring forward to their
expressing to Mr Meyer their their real desire in the matter will be
removed, as I am aware that they are totally averse to having any political
relations whatever with the Burghers of the New Republic.."

GH 706

Z201

Esselen to Havelock 1/9/89 Vryheid

"Sir, I have the honor, by direction of the Government, to address Y E on the subject of the Portecotoate over the Zulu Nation by the New Republic

In article IV of the Memorandum of Terms of Settlement of the 22nd October 1886, agreed upon between Y E representing & H B M' G and the deputation of the N R, it is agreed on behalf of the N R by the deputation to abandon all claims to a Protectorate over the Zulu Nation, provided the Zulu Nation made no objection to such abandonment of claims of a Protectorate. / 12/4 Y E wrote ~~was~~ informing the Pres that H M the Q had ~~extended~~ assumed supreme authority over Eastern Zululand / "with the knowledge and acquiescence of the Chiefs, and people" / and the Pres replied that the Zulus had not yet informed him if they wanted to be relieved of the Portecotate over them of the N R. 19/5 Y E informed Pres that H M the Q had approved of Zululand becoming part of the British dominions and acknowledged without comment. /

"I have now the honor to bring to Y E's notice, that on the 27th of August last, Dinuzulu, ^{Zulu} Undabuko & Mahanana Chanibezwa, son of Umjama Mapovela, ^{Zulu} Sonketchan and Bantubenzuma (representing Umjamana) ^{Zulu} Umkosan ^{Zulu} NTuzwa ^{Zulu} Dabankulu, ^{Zulu} Maboko, ^{Zulu} Sibamu and ^{Zulu} Makuluman, accompanied by a large number of other ^{Zulu} haemen of the Zulu Nation, had an interview with President Meyer and the other ^{Zulu} Members of the Executive Council at Vryheid, when they declared, that they and the Zulu People still claimed the protection of the New Republic as promised to them, and that they refused to give their consent to the withdrawal by the N R of the Protectorate over the Zulu Nation." / and that this was the opinion of a Great Council of the Zulu Nation lately held at

the King's ^Kraal. The Government of the N R is convinced of this feeling and therefore will / "be unable to agree to Article III of the Draft convention, and I have been directed...to ask Y E to be so good as to recommend to H B M's G, that the said Article III be rescinded." Minutes cover the correspondence that this aroused. Confl to S of S & 30/9/87

GH 707 Z228 Meyer to Havelock Wryheid 23/9/87 /Acks H's of 21/9 and grieved to learn that the receipt of an unsolicited statement by The Chiefs of Zululand should cause 'surprise and regret' to Y E and seem to present 'an unfriendly ~~an~~ aspect and disposition' when the Deputation of 18/10/86 from the NR understood that the heads of the Zulu should send a message to me on their feelings in regard to the proposed abandonment of the Potectorate. (See C4980 p83.) / "In receiving Dinuzulu and the principal chiefs of the Zulu Nation, for the purpose of learning their views with regard to the proposed abandonment of the Portectorate over them by the N R, the Government has been actuated by no other desire than to learn from the Zulus themselves their wishes in that respect, and has adopted a course which to me seems to have been perfectly legitimate in itself and absolutely necessary under the circumstances."

Boes: Hauser Bums offends

44

GH 707

Z22~~8~~7

High Commissioner Robinson to Havelock 23/9/87

Translation of teleg State President Pretoria to High Comm 19 ~~23~~/9/87

"This Government has the honour to bring to the knowledge of HMG that a treaty of union has been concluded between this Republic and the New Republic subject to the provisions of Article 4 of the convention of London, in terms whereof the said treaty will be sent to Y E for the purpose of communicating it to Her Majesty."

GH 824 Havelock to Robinson 29/9/87 confidential Ixopo

/On receiving above H telegrammed as follows / "Government of N R have been putting difficulties in the way of conclusion of Convention with Great Britain and have been intriguing with Dinuzulu and other Zulus now British subjects thereby causing much trouble. If Y E could intimate to President of the S A R that Treaty of Union with N R would not have approval until satisfactory conclusion of Convention with N R and unless NR ceases to interfere with Zulu Chiefs in Zululand, you would greatly assist in satisfactory settlement of Zululand. Am of opinion that if above conditions are fulfilled, it would be well not to oppose union of Republics...../ Considerable disquietude has been caused in Zululand since the assumption of the Queen's Sovereignty over the country through the dishonest and unlawful actions of Dinuzulu and of others of the family of the late King Cetuwa. Dinuzulu and his followers on being called upon to explain their conduct have assumed a defiant and rebellious attitude, the correction of which will, I fear, necessitate the exercise of force. This state of things may be attributed

acceptance of draft Convention by N R will
ask sofs for permission to do so.

in a certain degree to the dissatisfaction which is not unnaturally felt by
inuzulu and his family at the loss by them of power and profit consequent
upon the assumption of British Rule, but the evil has been greatly aggravated
by the intrigues of the authorities of the New Republic, and by the course of
action which is admitted in Mr Esselen's ~~last~~ despatch of the 1st September.

to have been taken by them. Moreover, the progress of the negotiations for
the conclusion of a Convention between HM and the NR has been retarded by
the obstruction of the NR. / / Treaty of Union between the Republics
should be dependent on the completion of the Convention. Assuming we could
recognise such a treaty feels strongly that the attitude and conduct of
the NR have been such to warrant HMG objecting to the Treaty under Provision
IV of the Treaty of London.. Probable that the Pres of the SAR will be
able to alter the NR'S 'objectionable course' and hopes that High Comm will
influence him to control and correct the action of the NR. It would not be
wise to oppose Union between the Republics / "But, the conclusion of a
satisfactory convention between Great B and the N R, and complete cessation
of interference by the authorities of the NR with the chiefs and people of
Zululnd should, I consider, be necessary preliminary conditions to favorable
consideration on the part of HMG of such a Treaty of Union."

GH707 2227 / 30/9/87 / forwards all above to S of S. / I hope confidential
Tele comms wizz between CT and Natal. Here is the culminating one
"8th Octr yours of yesterday The text of treaty of Union will be Y E's hands in
a few days It seems to me that by it the agreement of 22/10 is acknowledged in its

entirety & that article 4 of the agreement is therefore secure but were this otherwise I
should have thought that now we have annexed Zululand any claim to a protectorate over British
territory and B subjects be too preposterous to require formal abandonment / However after perusa
if you still want me to contact Kruger and say that Treaty depends on acceptance of

GH 707 Z266

44.1

Meyer to Havelcok 25/10/87 Vryheid

/Acks Hav's of 19/10 No 108 informing him that negotiations for the conculsuion of the convention with the N R have been suspended until the withdrawal of Esslengs letter of ~~L39x~~ 1/9 / " I beg leave to ask Y E to be so good ~~as~~ as to favor me with the reason for which the withdrawal of the letter above referred to is desired as I am unable, with the information at rpresent at my disposal, to understand on what gorunds the letter in question should be withdrawn.

CO 327/1

25274

Hav to Hol 58 12/11/87

Encl Meyer to Hav 12/11/87

/Acsk Hav ot 19/th and asks whey why the letter should be withdrawn

Enc 2 ¹¹av to Meyer 12/11/87

1 Zululand was on 19/5 became British Possisssion called Zululand.
and procalimed on ~~26~~ 21/6 publicly at Ehsowe. 7/7 pulbicily proclaimedat
Nkonjeni at which Ndabuko and Tnhin na were presented.
Zululand people were therefore British subjec s and therefore Esseln's
letter referring to the British subjects is an infringement on the rights
of ¹¹er Majesyt

1875

1876

1877

1878

1879

1880

1881

1882

1883

1884

1885

1886

1887

1888

1889

1890

1891

1892

1893

1894

1895

1896

1897

1898

1899

1900

1901

1902

1903

1904

CO 427/2

2726

2 ha-hol 11/1/88

Enc

Robinson to Hav Teleg 31/12/87

/Have just recieved following from S of S for Colonies_/

"Having communciated to the President of the SAR substance of your telegram of 15th November, I have recieved from him, today, private and confidential note, in which he expresses wish, before replying officially, to communicate with me in friendly manner, so as to, if possible, bring matters to a satisfactory conclusion for all parties. He has no objection to short convention between HMG and G of SAR, extending London convention 1884 over NR ~~to protect~~ and renouncing claim of NR to protectorate over Zulus. He considers that matters would be more speedily concluded if correspondence on subject were carried out by HMG with Government of SAR instead of with NR; an arrangement to which he could obtain consent of NR. In such case, he thinks prior convention between HMG and NR unnecessary, and considers way could be found for settlement of present difficulty ~~and~~ as to Proviso B. Letter is friendly and conciliatory in tone, and it is evident ~~that~~ that the President of the SAR is anxious to maintain friendly relations with HMG.

ENC 2 Rob to Hav teleg 5/1/88 "Have recieved the following cable message from the S of S... '4th In answer to your telegram of 31st December HMG agrees in your views of Pres of the SAR. The Gov of Natal should abstain from further corresponding with Meyer. You had better consult G of Natal whether you can dispense with convention with NR.. If so, boundary clause of

Convention, and possibly others, should be transferred to short Convention extending London Convention of 1884.

Enc3 Hav to Hol 7/1/88

/Received yours of 5/1 You ask my views on points referred to by S of S./
The point on which my views seem to be desired is whether you can dispense with Convention with NR. The commission of Articles Nos, 4, 10, 11, 12, 13, and 14 of the draft Convention, and the conceding the * point unconditionally as to Impalaza Spruit, which are authorized by the S of S in his teleg to you of 15/11, greatly reduce the importance of the convention. If the Pres of the SAR can and will, on behalf of the NR, and of his own Government, abandon claims of NR to Protectorate of Zululand, I do not think prior Convention between HMG and NR would be indispensable. There is an arrangement with Meyer concerning protection of graves of Zulu chiefs, which should be accepted by Transvaal Government. Will send you copy by post. I am informed that there is a party in the NR opposed to Union with Transvaal, but majority in favour of it. Settlers in Provinsio B are contented. They will not migrate to Transvaal unless under strong inducement. Natives in Provinsio B have made no complaints lately. Retention of Provinsio B as part of Zululand of vital importance."

Ben Union Protectorate unphdms

80

GH 709

Z21

Lucas Meyer to Havelock 14/1/88 Vryheid

/....I have decided to withdraw the said letter /of 1/9/89/ .../

/Havs telegs Rob for instructions/

17/1/88 "I think I should be disposed to inform Mr Meyer that you assent to the withdrawal of his letter, but that all further correspondence relating to the union of the N R with the S A R will be conducted between the High Commr & the Presenidtn of the S A R . President Kurger having proposed such an arrangement & promised to obtain the consent of the govt of the N R."

... to the ...

... to the ...

... to the ...

GH 708

Z297 Holland to Havelock 24/10/87

Ben: "Protectorate" 35
/Acks H's of 10/9 No39 informing him that the NR is unable to agree to the third article in the draft Convention which has been under negotiation between you for H M and Meyer & Co for the NR
~~The draft Provision begins xxx~~ Since the article was drawn up the territory in question has become part of H M dominions and thus the article has now no real effect. / "For there can be no protectorate or suzerainty by any foreign state or community in or over any part of HM's dominions or over any persons living within them; and I can only suppose that the pretension put forward in Mr Esselen's letter has been asserted in ignorance of its real purport.

I can only say, therefore, that until Mr Esselen's letter of the 1st of September is unconditionally withdrawn, all further negotiations for the recognition of the so-called 'New Republic,' or the conclusion of a definitive Convention, must be broken off, H M G in the mean time reserving all its rights under the Zulu Settlement of 1879, and otherwise, over the territory comprised within the boundaries described in Article I and proposed to be recognised as the 'New Republic. /

not to be with previous changes
GH 708 Z299 Holland to Havelock 25/10/87 confidential

m 20555
" A recent despatch from Sir H Robinson received to-day, acquaints me that he has received a treaty of Union between the SAR and the NR for their amalgamation as one State, subject to the approval of H Majesty.

The NR has not yet been recognised by H M as an independent State, and as the leaders of the community have advanced a claim to exercise a protectorate over the British possession of Zululand, the G of Natal has been

instructed to cease negotiations for their recongintion until that claim is withdrawn. It is evident that persons who have so little knowledte of the rights and duties of an indepen ent State as to make such a claim, cannot be recongized so long as this pretention is maintained. Without recongiton their incorporation with the S A R cannot take place, for the boundaries of that Republic are fixed by the Convention of London, and it has no mor right to estend them on the East, than it would have had to take in a potiion of Bechuanaland. I turst, however, that Mr Meyer and his friends have taken up t is position w htout fully relaizing its effect, and that they will abandon their proopsal, which really amounts to a cliam to protect certain of H M&s subjects against the Queen. In that even, without prejudging the questions which will arise on a formal applciation for approval of the Treaty, I may inform you, confidentially, that HMG would be all themore disposed to sanction such union, if they could count on receiving an assurance of the willingness of the SAR to grant farms within the Transvaal, to the occupants of farms in that portion of Zululand, which is often spoken of as the 'Provisio B' Dsistrcit, but is now officially k nown as the Entojaneni Distirct. /Unless they quit Zululand/

"I do not see how HMG can be relieved of the anxiety casued by their close prosimity to the Zulu subjects of the Crown."

C0427/1

20555

Hav to Hol 10/9/87 C P 390

Minutes "The Repr tied Union of the NR with the SAR renders it difficult to deal with this matter at its present stage. If the two Republics unite in asking ~~xx~~ our acquiescence in their union, this claim to 'protect' the status against the Queen, will probably be judiciously dropped

If it were not for this prospect of a Union, and if we were dealing only with the NR, I think that the proper answer would be to say that the negotiations for the Convention were broken off and would not be renewed except at the request of the NR. and that whilst the NR was required to take notice Zululand was British Territory, HMG could reserve all its rights, and would not for the present consider itself bound in any way to recognise the NR as an independent state - the ground to be assigned being that the tone of Dr Esslent's letter, which is quite different from that of Mr Falconer's representation, shows an absence of bona fides in the conduct of the negotiations.

However, as I have said, the whole matter is complicated by the prospect of union between the two Republics. I think that such an union is desirable in our interests. The ZN is too small a community to be efficiently governed, and we as its neighbours have an interest in its good government. It had better be part of the larger and wealthier neighbouring state.

I do not precisely understand what offence Dinuzulu is supposed to have committed in going to Vryheid and claiming the benefit of his treaty of 1884, made by him when a de facto independent sovereign. He is indeed a British subject, but he has become one nolen volens and has never taken That maybe so. But he has the oath of allegiance. The Boers are not the

no right now to claim
protectorate of Foreign
Power, however & however
made, in HMG's territory

I was only ^{holland} ~~adverting~~
to the chance of success
in a government

prosecution. I did
not mean to excuse his conduct

^{E F} by the Treaty of 1884 abiding the present correspondence put a different
completion on the facts ~~that~~ ^{that} from those present by Falconer and that we
will await further info before expressing an opinion and authorising 15/10.
"I have to suspect action on the part of the Dept referring to the protectorate." ^{E F}
/Bramston considers it amazing impudence and almost feels like breaking off
negotiations until it is withdrawn and Herbert agrees with him.

"I agree - conveying there intimate in firm & strident language. The New
Republic Boers no doubt think that their Union with the ~~ranva~~ enables them
to assert pretension which they could not otherwise have thought of -
and both Republics perhaps think that H. Govt is too timid or too lazy to
check any aggressions on its authority. RLWH Oct 15

/ ~~Hav~~ ~~agrees~~ Hol agrees and approves Hav stop negotiations unless the
letter is withdrawn. / "This may become a troublesome matter unless
dealt with firmly at once." H 17/10

/It was only printed in the ~~90xx~~ 1890. Hol ~~18~~ 18/10/87 "Stop further
negotiations unless Essel's letter withdrawn."
Hold to Hav 24/10/87 and Hol to Robinson 25/10/87

CO 879/32

No 390

Nol Hav to Holl 10/9/87 (2055)

Enclsoes desp from Esslen stating that D N and other Zulu chiefs declared before the exec Council at Vryheid that they claimed the protection for the New Republic and therefore the NR will be unable to agree to Art III of the Draft Convention.

The Action of the NR in holding these communications with British subjects appears to me to give grounds for complaint and I have expressed this in an enclosed letter to Meyer. The Conduct of Din Ndabuko etc constitutes a serious offence and I have ordered Osb to call upon them for an explanation. MO will investigate it before he leaves Nkonjeni and perhaps prefer charges against Din and N.

The authorities of the NR appear to content that the Portecotate they assumed by the proclamation of 16/8/84 still holds good and that they cannot withdraw it until the Zulu nation expresses its desire to be relieved of that Protectorate. But the agreement of 22/10/86 by Art IV ~~the~~ provides that the Protectorate will be withdrawn provided the Zulu nation does not object. they have expressed the desire to be relieved of Boer authority many times in the last three years. ~~they have acquiesced in His right to exercise~~ ~~sovereign~~ "Their acquiescence in the right of Her Majesty to exercise acceptance of British rule was conspicuously evinced by them on the occasion of the proclamation of the Queen's commission at Emsowen on the 21st June, and at Nkonjeni on the 7th July. Assuming that the declaration alleged by Esseln to have been made on 27/8 is genuine ~~it is not~~ which I doubt it cannot be the expression of the Zulu nation and was made too late.

Hav thinks that yye Boers ~~have~~ authorities have been intriguing with Din and his supporters in the hope that th4y might gain some advantage. But Osb will inquire ~~and then~~ / "and the prompt punishment of Cinuzulu for any offence against the law of which he may be convicted, will probably remove any mischievous impressions that may have been created in the minds of the natives, by what would appear to have been an unjustifiable act of interference on the part of the authorities of the NR in the affairs of HM's territory of Zululand"

Enc 1 State Sec Nr to Havelock Vryheid 1/9/87.

/Refers to Art, IV of Memo of the Terms of Settlement of 22/10/86

Meyer wrote in reply to your notification of est of HM's authority over

Eastern Zululand that the Zulu had not informed him of their ~~opinion~~

desire to be relieved of NR's protectorate and that he therefore had no power

to withdraw it.

Now informs Hav that on 27/8 Dinuzulu, Ndabuko, Mahanana, Tshianbezwe,

Mapovela, 'Souketchan, Bantubenzuma" Imkosan, N'Tuza, Dabankulu, Maboko,

Sibamu, Makuluman and many others interviews the Pres and Exc council

Vryheid and declared the Zulu people claimed the protection of the NR

as had been promised to them and refused to consent to the withdrawal

of the Protection of the New Republic. They stated they represented a great council

of the Nation recently held at the king's kraal. Therefore the Nr is unable

to agree to Art XIII of the draft convention.

Enc 2 Hav to Meyer 7/9/87 /Surprise and regret expressed and demonstrates /

Enc 3 Hav to Osb 7/9/87 /ask for explanations /

which says

that NR

abandons all

claims to

Protectorate

unless the Zulu

nation objects

TO 427/1

21518

Hav to Holldand 43 28/9/87

Meyer to Hav 23/9/87

/Acks 7/9/ "I am grieved to learn that the mere act of the Government in having recieved an unsolicited statement from Dinuzulu, and the principal Chiefs of the Zulu Nation, with eference to the Procyoract overthem by theNR, should have caused surpze and regret to YR"

/Ir eceived them to learn their views with regard to the abaondoment of the Protectorate only wanting to know what the Zulu thought/

Minutes "It hink that the New Republic~~x~~ Authorities erred rather rom stupidity and want of savoirfair than from ~~adviser~~^{a desire} to be imper tinent. In october last, we agreed to a prvision Article, IV making the withddaral of the Protectorate of the NR depednet on the absence of obj ection from the Zulu Nation. If we had had merely, after that, taken the Zulus under protection ourselves, it would have been open to the NR, after receving such communciation as it is stated to have received from the Zulus, to notify to us the non- fulfillment of the condition to which he had assented, and ~~per~~ perhaps event, to have put forward a claim to the revival of the Protectorate themselves. he fact that we have actually proc~~laimed~~ Zululand to the British territory carries with it legal consequenes which render such a /?/ on the partof the NR imporpoert; but it may be doubted if the authorities were fully laive to the improriety. The annexion of a place to the Critiwh Crwon converts the inhabitants who were previosuly alenies into subjects; but this is a doctinre resing upon a very long-winded and crabbed set of judgments

of Bacon and others refuted /?/ by Lor Coke two centuries and a half ago; and it can not be ~~confidentially~~ confidently asserted that Mr Lucas Myer has ever outwitted the case in question. What he ought to have done on receiving the Zulu Deputation, was either to explain to them that in consequence of the annexation of the country by Great Britain it was impossible to revert to the status quo anti ; or he might have ^{reported} ~~referred~~ the fact to us , at the same time observing that it was impossible to do so, unless HMG

/?/ cancel the annexation of the consequence of the action of the Zulus. We here he was wrong was in coming to 'protect' people who are technically British subjects. His error should be explained to him; but in view of the tone of this letter, it may be a question whether it should not be explained in less peremptory language than that of the draft despatch now in circulation.

E F 25/10/87

/Bramson doesn't think there so innocent/